NOTES ON SOME CULTIVATED TREES AND SHRUBS, III*

ALFRED REHDER

Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana (A. Murr.) Parl. f. **glaucescens** [Otto], comb. nov.

Cupressus Lawsoniana erecta glaucescens Sieb. ex [Otto in] Hamburg. Gart.- & Blumenzeit. 24: 141 (1868), non *C. L.* var. *erecta* Jäger (1865).

Cupressus Lawsoniana erecta glauca R. Smith, Pl. Fir Tribe, 15 [1874?].

Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana var. *erecta glauca* Beissner in Jäger & Beissner, Ziergeh. ed. 2, 451 (1884). — Schneider in Silva Tarouca, Uns. Freil.-Nadelh. 168 (1913) "var. *pyramidalis* f. *e.* subf. g." — Non *C. L.* var. *erecta* (Jäg.) Schneid. (1913).

Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana erecta glaucifolia Sudworth in U. S. Dept. Agric. For. Serv. Bull. 14: 83 (Nomencl. Arb. Fl. U. S.) (1897).

Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana var. *monumentalis nova* [hort. ex] Schneider in Silva Tarouca, Uns. Freil.-Nadelh. 168 (1913), pro syn.

Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana var. *erecta-glauca* Rehder, Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, 18 (1927).

The varietal epithet *"glaucescens,"* published by Otto in 1868 in a quaternary combination, is apparently the oldest available epithet for this form; the other epithet, *"erecta,"* is preoccupied by *erecta* in the combination *Cupressus Lawsoniana* var. *erecta* Jäger, Ziergeh. 200 (1865).

Corylaceae Mirbel, Elém. Phys. Vég. 2: 906 (1815), exclud. *Fagus;* emend. — Fernald in Rhodora, 47: 303 (1945), nom.

Amentaceae P. F. Gmelin, Otia Bot. 49, 90 (1760), p. p.

Betulaceae Bartling, Ord. Nat. Pl. 99 (1830), sensu stricto. — Horaninov, Prim. Lin. Syst. Nat. 63 (1834), sensu stricto. — A. Br. in Ascherson, Fl. Prov. Brandenb. 618 (1864). — Winkler in Engler, Pflanzenreich, IV. 61 (Heft 19): 1–149, *fig. 1–28, t. 1–2* (1904).

Trib. I. Betuleae [Dumort.], comb. nov.

Salicineae Mirbel, Elém. Phys. Vég. 2: 905 (1815), p. p. quoad sect. II.

Amentaceae b. *Betulaceae* C. A. Agardh, Aphor. Bot. 208 (1825). — Dumortier in Bijdr. Natuurk. Wetensch. 1: 45 (Verh. Wilg. 4) (1825) "Afd. 1."; Florula Belg. 11 (1827) "trib. *Betuleae*."

Betulaceae Bartling, Ord. Nat. Pl. 99 (1830), sensu stricto. — Regel in Nouv. Mém. Soc. Nat. Moscou, 13,2: 63 (Monog. Betul. 5) (1861).

Xylophyta 1. *Betuleae* Döll, Erklär. Laubkn. Ament. 10 (1848).

Betulaceae trib. *Betuleae* Ascherson, Fl. Prov. Brandenb. 619 (1864). — Winkler in Engler, Pflanzenreich, IV. 61 (Heft 19): 56 (1904).

Castanacées I. *Betuleae* Baillon, Hist. Pl. 6: 254 (1877).

Cupuliferae trib. I. *Betuleae* Bentham & Hooker f., Gen. Pl. 3: 403 (1880).

Betulaceae trib. *Alneae* et *Betuleae* Nakai, Fl. Sylv. Kor. 2: 7 (1915).

Trib. II. Coryleae (Meissn.), comb. nov.

Corylaceae Mirbel, Elém. Phys. Vég. 2: 906 (1815), exclud. *Fagus.* — Horaninov, Prim. Lin. Syst. Nat. 63 (1834), p. p. typ. — Lindley, Veg. Kingd. 290 (1846), p. p. typ. — A. de Candolle in De Candolle, Prodr. 16,2: 124 (1864).

Amentaceae d. *Corylaceae* Agardh, Aphor. Bot. 208 (1825), p. p. quoad *Corylus.*

Cupuliferae trib. *Corylaceae* Dumortier, Florula Belg. 14 (1827). — Meissner, Pl. Vasc. Gen. 1: 346 [1842] "trib. *Coryleae*."

Xylophyta 2. *Carpineae* Döll, Erklär. Laubkn. Ament. 15 (1848) "Carpineen."

* For nos. I and II see vol. 26, pp. 67 and 472.

Betulaceae trib. *Coryleae* Ascherson, Fl. Prov. Brandenb. 618 (1864).
Corylaceae trib. *Carpineae* et trib. *Coryleae* A. de Candolle in De Candolle, Prodr. 16,2: 124, 128 (1864).
Castanacées II. *Coryleae* Baillon, Hist. Pl. 6: 255 (1877).
Betulaceae trib. *Coryleae* (Meissn.) et trib. *Carpineae* (Döll) Nakai, Fl. Sylv. Kor. 2: 7 (1915).

As is shown by the synonymy given above, the oldest name for the family called Betulaceae should bear, according to the rules of priority, the name Corylaceae, as called recently by Fernald, though without any explanation or reference to earlier publications. The first author to unite the group published in 1815 by Mirbel as Corylaceae and that published in 1830 by Bartling as Betulaceae was apparently A. Braun, in Ascherson in 1864 (l.c.), who unfortunately chose Bartling's later name as the name for the amplified family, possibly because Mirbel had included *Fagus* in his Corylaceae, although the name shows that the family is based on *Corylus*. The acceptance of Corylaceae as the name of the family makes necessary new combinations for the two tribes into which this family is usually divided.

Amelanchier arborea (Michx. f.) Fern. f. **nuda** (Palmer & Steyerm.), comb. nov. *Amelanchier canadensis* f. *nuda* Palmer & Steyermark in Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 25: 772 (1938).

As Fernald has shown (in Rhodora, 43: 563, *t. 672, fig. 2.* 1941), the oldest specific epithet for the *Amelanchier* generally called *A. canadensis* is "*arborea*" (*Mespilus arborea* Michx. f.). Therefore, the above new combination becomes necessary for the form with glabrous leaves of this species, described as *A. canadensis* f. *nuda* by Palmer & Steyermark, of which we have collections ranging from W. Virginia to Illinois, Kansas, and Oklahoma.

Pyrus macropoda Rehder, nom. nov.
Pyrus longipes Cosson & Durieu in Bull. Soc. Bot. France, 2: 310 (1855). — Trabut in Bull. Stat. Recherch. For. N. Afr. 1: 116, *fig. 1, t. 4* (Poir. Indig. Afr.) (1916) "*Pirus*." — Non Poiteau & Turpin [1808].
Malus longipes Wenzig in Jahrb. Bot. Gart. Mus. Berlin, 2: 292 (1883).

The existence of an earlier homonym of *P. longipes* Coss. & Dur. makes necessary a new name for that species. Though the older homonym is based on a pomological form of *P. communis* and has never been taken up as a valid name by any later author, it has been validly published with a complete description and a colored plate as *P. longipes* Poiteau & Turpin in Duhamel, Traité des arbres fruitiers, nouv. éd. 4: *P.* no. *22*; *t. 57*, fasc. 10 [1808], and cannot be rejected under the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. In Index Kewensis, unfortunately, the names proposed by Poiteau & Turpin have not been correctly cited; they are credited to a later edition of Duhamel's work which was published by Poiteau under the title Pomologie française from 1838–46 in four volumes. The fact that Wenzig transferred *P. longipes* Cosson & Durieu together with *P. betulaefolia* Bge. to *Malus* shows that Wenzig had no clear concept of the characters of the genera of the Pomoideae; this is shown even more

strikingly by his referring *Chaenomeles sinensis* (Dum.-Cours.) Koehne as a variety to *P. communis L.*

Rosa multiflora f. **roseiflora** (Focke), f. nova.

Rosa multiflora v. *roseiflora* Focke ex Baenitz, Herb. Dendrol. in sched. (coll. 1902).

Rosa multiflora var. *Dawsoniana* hort. Rochester (Highland Park, Rochester, N. York).

CULTIVATED SPECIMENS: Breslau, Germany, Scheitniger Park, coll. *C. Baenitz,* July 9 and Aug. 8, 1902; Highland Park, Rochester, N. Y., *Wm. L. G. Edson,* June 14 and Oct. 11, 1922.

A typo speciei differt praecipue floribus semiplenis pallide roseis; folia 2.5–6 cm. longa, subtus sparse pubescentia; pedicelli glabri, sparse stipitato-glandulosi; ovarium glabrum vel fere glabrum; sepala extus pubescentia et stipitato-glandulosa, intus dense villosa; flores semipleni 2–3 cm. diam.; styli glabri.

Between the two specimens cited above, I can see no difference except that the flowers of the specimen from Rochester are somewhat smaller, about 2–2.5 cm. wide, while in the other specimen they are up to 3 cm. wide. The rose known as *R. multiflora* var. *carnea* Thory, introduced about 140 years ago, differs in its larger, fully double, deeper pink flowers, more densely pubescent leaves, and pubescent pedicels. The origin of the form described above is not known; the plant cultivated in Rochester is supposed to have come from the Arnold Arboretum about thirty years ago, but no such plant is now growing at that institution nor can any record of it be found.

Prunus avium f. **mamillaris** (Ser.), comb. nov.

Cerasus decumana M. D. L. [Mordant de Launay] in Bon Jard. 1808: 103 (1808). — Seringe in De Candolle, Prodr. 2: 536 (1825), pro syn.

Cerasus nicotianaefolia Mordant de Launay, l. c. (1808) *"nicotinaefolia,"* pro syn. — Hort. ex Seringe, l. c. (1825), pro syn.

Prunus macrophylla Poiret, Encycl. Méth. Bot. Suppl. 4: 584 (1816).

Cerasus duracina γ. mamillaris Seringe in De Candolle, Prodr. 2: 536 (1825).

Cerasus bigarella rostrata Poiteau & Turpin in Duhamel, Traité Arb. Fruit. nouv. éd., 2: *C.* no. 13; *t. 377,* fasc. 47 [1828]. — Poiteau, Pomol. Franç. 2: *C.* no. 10, p. 161, *t. 377* (18 [38–] 46).

Prunus nicotianaefolia Loiseleur ex Steudel, Nomencl. Bot. ed. 2, 2: 403 (1841), pro syn.

Prunus avium f. *decumana* Schneider, Ill. Handb. Laubh. 1: 616 (1906, May). — Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 6, 2: 152 (1906, Nov.) *"P. a.* B. 1. b. *d."*

As Schneider's combination under *P. avium* is not based on the oldest subspecific epithet, the combination proposed above becomes necessary. It may also here be pointed out that Poiret's name, *Prunus macrophylla,* of 1816 invalidates the later homonym *P. macrophylla* Sieb. & Zucc. of 1843, which has to receive a new name since it has no synonym to take its place.

Prunus Gondouini [*P. avium* × *Cerasus*] (Poit. & Turpin), comb. nov.

Cerasus sativa multifera Poiteau & Turpin in Duhamel, Traité Arb. Fruit. nouv. éd., 2: *C.* no. 28, *t. 3,* fasc. 1 [1807] non *Prunus sativa* Rouy & Camus (1900).

Cerasus Gondouini Poiteau & Turpin in op. cit., *C.* no. 29; *t. 66,* fasc. 11 [1808] *"Gundouini."* — Poiteau, Pomol. Franç. 2: *C.* no. 27; p. 127, *t. 66* (18 [38–] 46).

Cerasus regalis praecox Poiteau & Turpin in op. cit. *C.* no. 26, *t. 123,* no. 2, fasc. 21 [1811].

Cerasus anglica praecox Poiteau & Turpin in op. cit., *C.* no. 27, *t. 132,* fasc. 22? [1811].

Cerasus regalis communis et *C. r. serotina* Poiteau & Turpin in op. cit., *C.* no. 24, *t. 196,* no. 25, p. 197, fasc. 33 [1826].

?*Cerasus effusa* Host, Fl. Austr. 2: 6 (1831).

Prunus Cerasus δ. *Aproniana* Schübler & Martens, Fl. Würtemb. 313 (1834).

Cerasus caprioniana κ. *regalis* Roemer, Fam. Nat. Reg. Veg. Syn. 3: 74 (1847).

Prunus aproniana Beck, Fl. Nieder-Oester. 820 (1892).

Prunus avium var. *regalis* Bailey, Cycl. Am. Hort. [3]: 1453 (1901).

Prunus effusa (Host) Schneider, Ill. Handb. Laubh. 1: 616 (1906, May).

Prunus Cerasus × *avium* Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 6, 2: 153 (1906, Nov.).

Prunus avium × *Cerasus* Hedrick, Cherries New York, 31, *t.* (1915).

For the group of hybrids between *Prunus avium* and *P. Cerasus* known as Duke Cherries, the name *Prunus effusa* (Host) Schneid. has been used by recent authors as a binary name based on *Cerasus effusa* Host. There are, however, several older Latin binomials used for different forms of this hybrid by Poiteau & Turpin between 1807 and 1826 which have been generally overlooked; in Index Kewensis they are ascribed to Poiteau, Pomologie française (1838–46), which is a later edition under a new title of Poiteau & Turpin's edition of Traité des arbres fruitiers by Duhamel. The much enlarged edition by Poiteau & Turpin was published in 71 fascicles between 1807 and 1835, but the text and plates were rearranged according to genera and published finally in six volumes, all bearing the date 1835.

As the synonymy given above shows, the oldest binomial is *Cerasus sativa,* but its specific epithet cannot be transferred to *Prunus* on account of *P. sativa* Rouy & Camus (Fl. Franç 6: 4. 1900), a name proposed to include as subspecies *P. domestica, P. ambigua,* and *P. insititia.* The next oldest name, *Cerasus Gondouini,* is based on "Belle de Choisy," a well-known form and one of the best of the Duke Cherries (cf. Hedrick, Cherries New York, 116. 1915), representing one of the forms of the hybrid *P. avium* × *P. Cerasus.*

According to Poiteau & Turpin (l.c.) this hybrid was raised about 1760 by Gondouin, gardener of the royal gardens at Choisy near Paris. As Poiteau & Turpin apparently intended to name this cherry in honor of its raiser, Gondouin, it must be assumed that the spelling *C. Gundouini* is a mistake and the name should be *C. Gondouini,* as later spelled by Poiteau (l.c.).

Vitis acerifolia Rafinesque, Med. Fl. 2: 130, *t. 99, fig. C* (1830, pref. May); Am. Man. Grape Vines, 14, *fig. 3* (1830).

Vitis Longii Prince, Treat. Vine, 184 (1830), copyright Sept. 20. — Rehder, Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, 602 (1927) "? *V. rupestris* × *arizonica.*" — Bailey in Gent. Herb. 3: 228, *fig. 103, 121* (1934).

Vitis rubra var. *Solonis* Planchon, Vignes Amér. 118 (1875).

Vitis Solonis Hort. Berol. ex Planchon, op. cit. 119 (1875), pro syn. — Planchon ex Rehder, Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, 602 (1927), pro syn.

Vitis Nuevo Mexicana Lemmon ex Munson in Trans. Am. Hort. Soc. 3: 132 (1885). — Munson in Wine & Fruit Grower, 7: 85 (1885).

Vitis novo-mexicana Munson in Proc. Soc. Prom. Agric. Sci. 1887: 59 (1887), "*Novo Mexicana.*"—Foëx, Cours Compl. Vitic. éd. 2, 876 (1888), "*Novo-Mexicana.*"—Bailey in Gent. Herb. 3: 228 (1934).

In the discussion under *Vitis Longii* regarding the priority of the names *V. Longii* and *V. acerifolia,* Bailey (l.c.) makes the following statement: "As both *Longii* and *acerifolia* were published in 1830, one cannot choose between them by priority. One description is about as good as the other, but Prince had the plant in fruit. Inasmuch as the name *Longii* has been adopted for many years it may be retained."

However, there can be hardly any doubt that Rafinesque's publication has priority, for the preface is dated May, 1830; the copyright date of Prince's Treatise is September 20 of the same year. The American Manual of the Grape Vines by Rafinesque, with the exception of a few slight changes and corrections, is an exact reprint apparently from the same type (pp. 121–180) of his Medical Flora, vol. 2, and issued soon after. The references in the text of the Manual to the figures of the two plates give both the letters used in the Medical Flora and the numerals used in the Manual; also the mistake in the Medical Flora of calling fig. G "*V. multiflora*" is corrected in the Manual to *V. multiloba.*

Pieris japonica (Thunb.) D. Don f. **crispa,** f. nova.

A typo recedit foliis insigniter crispato-undulatis, acumine plus minusve torto, 5–7 cm. longis et 1–1.8 cm. latis.

CULTIVATED: Garden of Carl S. English, Jr., Seattle, Washington, coll. December 31, 1945 (Herb. Arnold Arb.).

The strongly undulate crispate margin of the leaves gives this form a rather striking appearance and makes the foliage look denser and more attractive.

Fraxinus sect. **Fraxinaster** DC. subsect. **Petlomelia** (Nieuwl.), comb. nov.

Fraxinus sect. *Fraxinaster* subsect. *Dipetalae* Lingelsheim in Bot. Jahrb. 40: 215 (1907).

Petlomelia Nieuwland in Am. Midland Nat. 3: 187 (1914).

The subdivision of *Fraxinus* based on *F. dipetala* Hooker & Arnott was first distinguished as a subsect. of the sect. *Fraxinaster* DC. by Lingelsheim (l.c.) and called subsect. *Dipetalae.* As the names of the other subsections are nouns, it seems logical that the names of the coördinated subdivisions should also be nouns. To have the name of coördinated divisions partly nouns and partly adjectives in plural prevents a clear presentation of the grouping of subordinated divisions in a large genus and is against general usage. The Rules of Botanical Nomenclature in this case are rather vague and I therefore proposed about six years ago a change in Art. 26 of the Rules (see Jour. Arnold Arb. 20: 269. 1939) which, I hope, will be considered at the next Botanical Congress and will lead to a modification of that article.

Lavandula officinalis f. **alba** (Gingins-Lass.), comb. nov.

Lavandula vera β. *alba* de Gingins-Lassaraz, Hist. Nat. Lavandes, 147 (1826).

Lavandula Spica β. *alba* Sweet, Hort. Brit. 316 (1827), nom. subnud.; non Weston (1770).

Lavandula officinalis f. *albiflora* Rehder in Jour. Arnold Arb. 20: 428 (1939).

When I proposed in 1939 the combination *L. officinalis* f. *albiflora* (l.c.) for the white-flowered form of *L. officinalis* Chaix (*L. spica* L., p.p.), because *L. Spica β. alba* Sweet was invalidated by the older homonym *L. Spica* var. *alba* Weston, Bot. Univ. 1: 146 (1770), which is a form of *L. latifolia* Villars, I had not seen the publication of 1826 by Gingins-Lassaraz of *L. vera β. alba* which antedates *L. Spica β. alba* Sweet and presents the oldest available epithet for the white-flowered form of *L. officinalis*.

Senecio puffini H. H. Allan in litt., nom. nov.

Senecio rotundifolius Hooker f., Fl. Nov.-Zeland. 1: 149 (1853). — Cheeseman, Man. New Zealand Fl., ed. 2 (W. R. B. Oliver), 1026 (1925).—Non Stokes (1812), nec Lapeyrouse (1813).

Brachyglottis rotundifolia Forster f., Char. Gen. Pl. Austral. 92 (1776).

Cineraria rotundifolia Forster f., Fl. Ins. Austral. Prodr. 56 (1786).

The fact that *S. rotundifolius* Hook. f. is antedated by two earlier homonyms, namely *S. rotundifolius* Stokes, Bot. Mat. Med. 4: 215 (1812) = *S. aureus* L., and Lapeyrouse, Hist. Abr. Pl. Pyrén. 517 (1813) = *S. Doronicum* L., makes necessary a new specific epithet. Dr. H. H. Allan, of Wellington, New Zealand, whom I had asked if perhaps some New Zealand botanist had not already proposed a new name for this homonym, suggests that it might be named *Senecio puffini*, since this shrub is a haunt of the mutton bird (*Puffinus griseus*) and is locally known as mutton bird scrub; this proposition has been accepted here.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.